UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/582,543	09/25/2000	Karola Scheidig	P00,1147	2932

7590 03/24/2004

SCHIFF HARDIN & WAITE
PATENT DEPARTMENT
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
SEARS TOWER 66 FLOOR
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER	
VU, KIEU D	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/582,543	SCHEIDIG, KAROLA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kieu D Vu	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 February 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is responsive to the RCE Request and the Amendment filed 02/05/04.

2. Claims 1-15 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney (USP 5917484) in view of Evanitsky et al ("Evanitsky", USP 5045880).

Regarding claims 1 and 6, Mullaney teaches a method for controlling an operator interface of a computer-controlled system, comprising the steps of processing a control panel program by a computer, said control panel program defining an operator interface on a screen (400 in Fig. 4), providing a plurality of display fields on the operator interface, said plurality of display fields containing graphic elements text (402-416 in Fig. 4), storing a graphics bitmap with contains pixels corresponding to graphics element to be represented for each of said plurality of display fields (col. 4, lines 27-29), storing a plurality of language versions in text files for the text of each of said plurality of display fields (col. 4, lines 33-36), selecting one simple language for the texts of all of said

plurality of display fields depending on an input instruction (col. 3, lines 62-67), loading the graphics bitmap that belong to every one of said plurality of display fields into a main memory of the computer (col. 4, lines 29-33), accessing text files of the language selected in said selecting step, and displaying the display fields by representing text pixels of the text files of the selected language together with the pixels of the corresponding graphics bitmap for each display field (Fig. 5). Mullaney differs from the claims in that Mullaney does not teach that there are plural graphics elements and text displayed. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Evanitsky. Evanitsky teaches a system for programming reproduction machines, the system comprises displaying on screen 220 several graphics elements and text (see Fig. 10). Part 270 of screen 220 presents several icons (302, 304, etc.), each of them displayed with corresponding text for specifying the function of the icon (see Fig. 10 and column 12-14). Since both references are in the same field displaying graphic elements and text on the same screen, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Mullaney and Evanitsky before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface system taught by Mullaney to include the displaying several graphics element and text taught by Evanitsky with the motivation being to increase the user friendliness of the system by displaying more graphic elements on the screen.

Regarding claims 3 and 8, Evanitsky teaches a touch sensitive screen display to accept input from users (column 3, lines 39-45).

Regarding claims 11 and 13, Evanitsky teaches that the system is printer (col 1, lines 5-8).

Regarding claims 12 and 14, Evanitsky teaches that the system is printer (col 1, lines 5-8).

Regarding claim 15, Mullaney teaches a method for controlling an operator interface of a computer-controlled system, comprising the steps of processing a control panel program by a computer, said control panel program defining an operator interface on a screen (400 in Fig. 4), providing a plurality of display fields on the operator interface, said plurality of display fields containing graphic elements text (402-416 in Fig. 4), storing a graphics bitmap with contains pixels corresponding to graphics element to be represented for each of said plurality of display fields (col. 4, lines 27-29), storing a plurality of language versions in text files for the text of each of said plurality of display fields (col. 4, lines 33-36), selecting one simple language for the texts of all of said plurality of display fields depending on an input instruction (col. 3, lines 62-67), loading the graphics bitmap that belong to every one of said plurality of display fields into a main memory of the computer (col. 4, lines 29-33), accessing text files of the language selected in said selecting step, and displaying the display fields by representing text pixels of the text files of the selected language together with the pixels of the corresponding graphics bitmap for each display field (Fig. 5). Mullaney differs from the claims in that Mullaney does not teach that the operator interface is of a printer which enables plural graphics elements and text displayed. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Evanitsky. Evanitsky teaches a system for programming reproduction machines, the system comprises displaying on screen 220 several graphics elements and text (see Fig. 10). Part 270 of screen 220 presents several icons

(302, 304, etc.), each of them displayed with corresponding text for specifying the function of the icon (see Fig. 10 and column 12-14). Since both references are in the same field displaying graphic elements and text on the same screen, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Mullaney and Evanitsky before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface system taught by Mullaney to include the displaying several graphics element and text taught by Evanitsky with the motivation being to increase the user friendliness of the system by displaying more graphic elements on the screen.

5. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney in view of Evanitsky as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Daly et al ("Daly", USP 4907282).

Regarding claims 2 and 7, Mullaney in view of Evanitsky teaches the invention substantially as specified in claims 1 and 6 above. Mullaney does not teach the storing bitmaps in a ROM component. However, this feature is known in the art as taught by Daly. Daly teaches a method for constructing, storing, and displaying characters which comprises storing bitmaps in a ROM component (col 2, lines 17-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Mullaney and Daly before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface method taught by Mullaney to include storing bitmaps in a ROM component taught by Daly with the motivation being to enable the user to apply Mullaney's method in computer systems that are not used to display graphics.

6. Claims 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney in view of Evanitsky as applied to claims 3 and 8 above, and further in view of and Frary et al ("Frary", WO 90/12358).

Regarding claims 4 and 9, Mullaney in view of Evanitsky does not teach selecting the language in the application-menu from an initial menu. However, this feature is known in the art as taught by Frary. Frary teaches a multi-lingual operator control panel which comprises selecting the language in the application-menu (Fig. 2) from an initial menu 30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Mullaney before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface method taught by Mullaney to include selecting the language in the application-menu from an initial menu taught by Frary with the motivation being to enable the system to give users different ways to choose the desired language.

7. Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney in view of Evanitsky as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of and Kumano ("Kumano", USP 5978754).

Regarding claims 5 and 10, Mullaney in view of Evanitsky does not teach steps of reading out the new text from the appertaining text file, and displaying the text that was read out instead of the previous text without changing the graphics bitmap of the appertaining display field given a change of the language. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Kumano. Kumano teaches a translation display apparatus which comprises displaying the change in language without changing the image (Fig. 4A – 4B). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the

teaching of Mullaney and Kumano before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface method taught by Mullaney to include displaying the change in language without changing the image taught by Frary with the motivation being to use the same images for different languages.

8. Response to Applicant's arguments filed 02/05/04.

In response to Applicant's argument regarding the Mullaney and Evanitsky references, it is noted as below.

Mullaney teaches the substantially as specified above. The only difference between Mullaney and claim 1 is that just one graphic element displayed on the screen in Fig. 5 while in claim 1, several graphic elements are displayed. Evanitsky teaches a system for programming reproduction machines, the system comprises displaying on screen 220 several graphics elements and text (see Fig. 10). Part 270 of screen 220 presents several icons (302, 304, etc.), each of them displayed with corresponding text for specifying the function of the icon (see Fig. 10 and column 12-14). Since both references are in the same field displaying graphic elements and text on the same screen, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Mullaney and Evanitsky before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the interface system taught by Mullaney to include the displaying several graphics element and text taught by Evanitsky with the motivation being to increase the user friendliness of the system by displaying more graphic elements on the screen.

The Daly reference is combined with the Mullaney reference since both references are in the same field of constructing, storing, and displaying graphic pixels and text.

The Frary reference is combined with the Mullaney reference since both references are in the same field of multilingual interface.

The Kumano reference is combined with the Mullaney reference since both references are in the same field of displaying text and graphics bitmap where new text can be read out to replace existing text.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kieu D. Vu whose telephone number is (703-605-1232). The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached on (703- 308-3116).

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)-872-9306

and / or:

(703)-746-5639 (use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper / amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-3900).

JOHN CABECA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Kieu D. Vu

03/17/04